REMARKS

Applicant's counsel thanks the Examiner for the careful consideration of the application.

The present application contains claims 1-5, 7-9, 14-21, 23-24, 26-28, and 32.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7-9, 14-21, 23-24, 26-28, and 32 under U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Hamilton et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,009,464), hereinafter referred to as Hamilton; in view of Balasubramanian et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,701,441), hereinafter referred to as Balasubramanian.

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

1. The Examiner stated that Hamilton at col. 4, lines 65-col. 5, line 5, and col. 6, lines 35-55 teaches the limitations of "a database comprising information for the location of files associated with an application that can be installed on the client"; "a platform independent executable program deliverable by the server to the client for execution thereon"; and "a browser hosted process on the client resulting from execution of the platform independent executable program on the client".

This is not correct.

Hamilton at col. 4, lines 65-col. 5, line 5, and col. 6, lines 35-55 does not teach or suggest the claimed limitations. Hamilton at col. 4, lines 65-col. 5 discusses how ORB specific code sends and receives data. Hamilton at col. 6, lines 35-55 discusses the same in more details.

As stated in the Response filed on July 17, 2006, Hamilton only mentions a "path" (column 4, line 66) 210 between the client 120 and the server 130. All the communications between the client and the server are going through the object request brokers (ORBs, 160, 200) in the client and server. For example, it is stated at column 4, lines 59 to 63: "In operation, when application program 140 attempts to invoke a method of object 180, application program 140 invokes stubs 150. Stubs 150 marshal the appropriate data for the method invocation and the ORB specific code 160 transmits the data to ORB specific code 200."

Furthermore, as stated in the Response filed on July 17, 2006, there is a clear difference between "stubs" and the "platform independent executable program" as claimed in the present invention. The "stubs" of Hamilton "are used to marshal arguments from application program 230

10

into marshal buffers 280, call subcontracts 270 to execute remote calls, and to unmarshal any results from a network server" (column 5, lines 14 to 17). The platform independent executable program of the present invention, for example, a Java applet, interacts directly with an operating system resident on the client and communicates with the server resident process through a communication pipe (see page 14 to 15 of the present application).

2. The Examiner stated that Hamilton at column 6, lines 10-25 teaches the claimed limitations "communication pipe established by the browser hosted process, the communication pipe being bidirectional, and enabling exclusive communication between the server resident process on the server and the operating system and browser hosted process on the client" and "the browser hosted process accessing resources of the operating system on the client by installing, invoking or reading output from, executable files on the client".

This is not correct.

Hamilton at column 6, lines 10-25 does not teach or suggest, at least, "communication pipe being bidirectional, and enabling exclusive communication between the server resident process on the server and the operating system and browser hosted process on the client".

The claimed feature of "a communication pipe" has been discussed in previous Responses and telephone interviews.

3. Balasubramanian provides nothing to overcome the basic deficiencies of Hamilton. In addition, the Examiner stated that it would be obvious to have incorporated Balasubramanian with the teachings of Hamilton, "for the purpose of prevent hackers from activating different subroutines embedded in a computer executable code downloaded ...". Applicant fails to understand the stated purpose in relation to the present claimed invention.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection.

If any further fees are required by this communication, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, Order No. 33262.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By _John P. Murtaugh_

John P. Murtaugh, Reg. No. 34226

1801 East 9th Street, Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
Phone: 216-579-1700

Date: February 22, 2007

12